

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-1778

UMA VISWANATHAN, for herself individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE SCOTLAND COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION; DAVID
A. MARTIN, Dr., in his individual and official
capacity; LINDA DOUGLAS, in her official and
individual capacity; RAY OXENDINE, in his of-
ficial and individual capacity; MALCOLM FORDE,
in his official and individual capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle Dis-
trict of North Carolina, at Rockingham. James A. Beaty, Jr.,
District Judge; Russell A. Eliason, Magistrate Judge. (CA-94-4-3)

Submitted: January 18, 1996

Decided: January 31, 1996

Before HAMILTON and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and CHAPMAN, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Uma Viswanathan, Appellant Pro Se. Nickolas Joseph Sojka, Jr.,
WILLIAMSON, DEAN, BROWN, WILLIAMSON & PURCELL, Laurinburg, North
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's February 6, 1995, order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss. Appellant also appeals from the district court's orders of May 1, 1995, denying her post-judgment motions styled pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b), 59(e), and 55(c); January 26, 1995, November 17, 1994, and June 3, 1994, granting extensions of time to file and serve various pre-trial motions and discovery; October 17, 1994, denying Appellant's several pre-trial motions; and August 22, 1994, granting Defendants' motion for sanctions. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. While it appears from the record that Appellant's post-judgment motions were timely filed, we find that the district court properly denied those motions on the merits. Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. Viswanathan v. Scotland County, No. CA-94-4-3 (M.D.N.C. June 3, 1994; Aug. 22, 1994; Oct. 17, 1994; Nov. 17, 1994; Jan. 26, 1995; Feb. 6, 1995). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED